

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s) Laxmi P. Parida
Docket No : YOR920010446US2
Serial No.: 10/081,834
Filing Date: February 22, 2002
Group: 2171
Examiner: Ritesh Agrawal

Title: Pattern Discovery Techniques for Determining Maximal Irredundant and Redundant Motifs

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Examiner's November 29, 2006 Official Action.

The Examiner found that the claims of the instant application, which are directed to pattern discovery techniques for determining maximal irredundant and redundant motifs, describe five distinct inventions. The Examiner therefore required that the application be restricted to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1- 15, drawn to a method for pattern discovery, classified in class 702, subclass 19;
- II. Claims 16-17, drawn to a computer system for pattern discovery, classified in class 703, subclass 21;
- III. Claims 18-23, drawn to a method for determining motif sets, classified in class 702, subclass 19;
- IV. Claims 24-25, drawn to a computer system for determining motif sets, classified in class 703, subclass 21; and
- V. Claim 26, drawn to a method for maximizing redundancy between motifs, classified in class 702, subclass 19.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn, since each Group is generally drawn to pattern discovery techniques for determining

maximal irredundant and redundant motifs, and it is believed that a complete search for each Group would require a search of most, if not all, of the individual classes and subclasses. Accordingly, Applicant submits that an examination of both Groups would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. Where, as here, "the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions." MPEP §803.

In particular, Applicant submits that the method and corresponding computer system, such as Groups I and II, and Groups III and IV, should certainly be considered together. The novelty of the computer is determined by evaluating the novelty of the implemented method.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be reconsidered and withdrawn and that all of the pending claims in the application be examined together in this application. Alternatively, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims of Groups I and II be examined together in this application. In the alternative, Applicant hereby elects Group I, claims 1-15, for prosecution in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: December 22, 2006

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560